Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Preparation and two lessons

- Inspect the chosen print size or digital zoom. Fold marks and old lettering can obscure details. Offer a neutral reading of a label, supplied source card or alternative description; note support when interpreting a check.
- Print Lessons and Practice. Keep the Independent Check, Follow-up Check and teacher answers for their selected use. The later tasks reuse the same originals with different areas and claims. Do not describe them as completely unseen maps.
- Lesson 1, 35–45 minutes: orient to the source card and named anchors (about 5 minutes); model observation with the earlier crop (about 8); students read each map (about 10); discuss the worked anchor model and complete the comparison (about 12–20).
- Lesson 2, 35–45 minutes: revisit observations (about 5); read the short report and paraphrase (about 8); build the event/report timeline (about 7); explain with three sources and test the stronger claim (about 15–25). These are estimates, not measured timings.

Use this discussion model after students try the comparison: “The earlier map places a shoreline close to the west of the Common. The later map shows Public Garden and a grid including Marlborough Street and Commonwealth Avenue toward the Charles River. Together they suggest a changed depicted land and street pattern. The report adds evidence of Back Bay filling work and land payment during 1860. These sources do not identify the date or cause of every feature.”

Describe maps as selected representations. Source date, depicted context, purpose, coverage and scale all matter. Do not equate blank paper with water or absent label with physical absence. The printed 1883 original has scale 1:19,800; no matched numerical scale is supplied for the earlier plan. Printed crop size cannot provide an area or width ratio.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Use the checks and respond

Give the Mill Pond packet after instruction, then read each component using the guidance below. Explain only the supplied neutral location guide during the check if needed. Save South of Essex Street until after selected practice. Note whether a learner saw full maps, crops, keys, a model or the same task before responding.

What the response suggests on this task	A useful next opportunity
Correct relevant features; comparison still thin	Continue Practice: make each claim traceable to a source.
Dates, blank areas or missing labels misread	Clarify the Source: correct one interpretation and explain the rule.
Cause or inference replaces observation; weak map detail	Reteach: point to a feature, describe it, then connect observations.
Reasoned comparison with a useful limit	Extend: examine source perspective and missing voices; or Apply Source Reading.
Labels inaccessible or writing hides reasoning	Use Source and Reading Supports; allow pointing, dictation or oral explanation, then record the conditions.

Read source accuracy, anchor use, comparison, report relevance and limits separately. A correct conclusion supported only by a missing label needs further work on evidence. A cautious alternate interpretation can be strong if it uses both maps accurately and explains uncertainty. Do not convert this guidance into an overall score or claim general mastery.

When a response contradicts the visible crop, invite the learner to show the feature they used. When they read labels accurately but overgeneralize the report, focus on place and time. Recheck the selected reasoning move on the later task under known conditions. Practice completion alone does not establish transfer.

Local notes may describe a group’s need without names. The optional Planning Record asks for task, exposure, support, reasoning and next action; no student data needs to be uploaded.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 1

Earlier-map observation

Task: Locate COMMON and Beacon Street. Describe one visible feature next to the Common, using a label or a line pattern. Say what the map shows, without giving a cause.

Read the response: Accept the heavy curved boundary to the left of COMMON, tree symbols around part of it, Beacon Street above it, or named streets/blocks to its right. Require a concrete source feature and observation wording. Do not require an inference that the blank area is water. A cause such as workers filled it is outside this observation.

Later-map observation

Task: Locate PUBLIC COMMON and Beacon St. Describe one visible feature on the side toward the Charles River, using a label or line pattern. Keep your statement about this map.

Read the response: Accept PUBLIC GARDEN beside the Common, a street grid containing Marlborough St/Commonwealth Avenue/Beacon St, or river label/parallel shore lines beyond the streets. Require visible location and feature; no exact acreage, building date or claimed motive.

Compare the Common area

Task: Use the two preceding details. Identify the shared anchors. Give one observation from each map and explain a supported difference in the depicted land, water boundary or streets near the Common. Add one reason the comparison cannot give an exact amount of physical change.

Read the response: Require COMMON/PUBLIC COMMON and Beacon Street/Beacon St as anchors; a detail from each, such as earlier nearby west shoreline versus later Public Garden and street grid toward Charles; inference that the depicted pattern around the Common changed/landward street network extended toward river. Accept cautious alternatives grounded in both. Limit: different coverage/scale, cropped extent or lack of matched survey measurements. Do not accept precise acreage or inference solely from missing labels.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 2

Put the evidence in time

Task: Write a short timeline with the earlier map publication, the year of work/payment described in the report, the report date, and the later map publication. Explain why 1861 is not the same kind of date as 1860 here.

Read the response: Timeline: 1775 earlier map published; 1860 land conveyed/payment for prior Back Bay filling work; February 7, 1861 report printed/dated; 1883 later map published. Explain event described versus report date. The maps do not give exact survey dates. The 1882 copyright entry is distinct from 1883 publication, not a replacement for it.

Explain with three sources

Task: Write an explanation of the changed pattern near the Common toward Back Bay. Include a detail from each map, what the report adds, and one limit on your explanation. Use source names or dates so a reader can follow your evidence.

Read the response: Require accurate earlier/later visible pattern evidence, such as earlier close west shoreline and later streets/Public Garden toward Charles; report adds human filling work and land payment during 1860. Infer filling contributed to development of land/street pattern toward Back Bay without assigning every visible street/change to Munson. Limit may be exact location/amount/date of all work, completion, motives or residents experiences. Do not demand the same prose as the model.

Test a stronger claim

Task: A caption says, “The 1861 report proves the whole Back Bay was finished that year and everyone benefited.” Explain which parts the supplied passage supports and which parts need other evidence.

Read the response: Supports contractor filling Back Bay and payment in 1860 for earlier work. Does not support finished whole area in 1861 or universal benefits. Need completion/construction records for timing/extent and evidence from affected people for benefits; cite report perspective. Reasonable specific alternative sources are accepted.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 3

Mill Pond: earlier observation

Task: Describe the labeled area Mill Pond and one neighboring labeled street or boundary. Keep observation separate from explanation.

Read the response: Mill Pond is a bounded labeled area; accept the adjoining Prince Street/Back Street boundary, E. by N. Mill Dam along the upper edge, or nearby Hanover/Salem streets with the relationship stated accurately. No requirement to name the cause of filling. Accept accurate verbal or annotated equivalents.

Mill Pond: later observation

Task: Name two visible features in or beside the Causeway/Beverly/Merrimac area. State what kinds of features they are, using the printed map evidence.

Read the response: Accept two actual labeled streets (Causeway, Beverly, Merrimac) as streets, Boston & Maine Depot or Boston & Lowell Depot as depots, or labeled rail line as rail. Require two features correctly read and located in vicinity. Avoid wharves elsewhere as if occupying former pond. No filling claim required.

Mill Pond: compare the pattern

Task: Using the supplied location guide, give one detail from each map that supports a difference in the depicted pattern in the Mill Pond vicinity. Explain the difference as an inference. Name a reason to be cautious about an exact physical comparison.

Read the response: Earlier labeled bounded Mill Pond versus later Causeway/Beverly/Merrimac street/depot network in matched general vicinity; inference pattern changed from depicted pond to built/street network. Caution: approximate anchors/changed boundaries, scale/coverage, no exact overlay/survey date. Missing Mill Pond label alone insufficient. Do not require exact placement of a depot within historical pond boundary.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 4

Mill Pond: choose relevant evidence

Task: Could the Back Bay report passage from the lessons establish the cause or completion date of the Mill Pond change? Explain using the named place and the limits of that passage.

Read the response: No: passage is about Back Bay filling/payment during 1860, not Mill Pond. Need place-specific dated records for Mill Pond cause/completion. It cannot be generalized to every city change. A response that proposes useful additional source types and keeps place distinction meets criterion.

Trace the claim

Task: Write your claim. Then give a map detail from 1775, a map detail from 1883 and a report detail. Explain which detail helps describe the difference and which helps explain human action.

Read the response: Claim limited to changed depicted pattern/development toward Back Bay. Each map detail correct and relevant; report filling/payment detail accurate. Distinguish comparison evidence from report contribution about human action, not claim report locates every change precisely. Alternatives welcome when all sources support them.

Improve the limit

Task: Write a limit that names a particular unanswered question about your claim. Explain what additional kind of source could help answer it.

Read the response: Specific unresolved question (extent, exact completion date, decision maker motives, experiences) plus source logically useful (survey/construction records, minutes, residents/workers accounts). A generic “we need more evidence” without question/source connection needs follow-up.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 5

Correct the date reading

Task: A reader says, “The later map is an 1882 snapshot, and the report says filling started and ended in 1861.” Rewrite this as an accurate statement using the source cards and the report meaning in the lessons.

Read the response: Later map published 1883 with copyright entry 1882; no exact survey date. Report dated February 7, 1861 describes payment during 1860 for filling already done. Passage gives neither start nor end date. Both errors corrected, with accurate distinction.

Correct the map reading

Task: A reader says, “Every blank patch is water; if a label disappears, the place disappeared.” Explain two checks you would make before accepting those claims.

Read the response: Check labels/boundary patterns/context/legend where supplied to interpret blank; compare matched anchor vicinity, coverage, scale and selection before treating absent label as physical absence. Need one check for each claim, with clear reason. No blanket blank=land replacement.

Reteach: earlier evidence

Task: Finish “This map shows …” with a label and its relationship to COMMON. Underline the words that tell where you looked.

Read the response: Concrete accurate label/feature relationship: Beacon Street above COMMON, curved boundary on its left, trees along edges or Newbury near right. Underlined location phrase or verbal equivalent. No cause required.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 6

Reteach: observation and inference

Task: Write one observation from this map. Then write an inference about a difference near the Common using that observation and your earlier-map observation. Finish “This does not tell me …” with a specific limit.

Read the response: Later observation visible Public Garden/street grid/river boundary. Paired inference connects earlier nearby boundary and later land/street pattern, not merely different labels. Limit specific amount/date/cause/experiences or comparison uncertainty. Accept cautiously worded alternative with both observations.

Perspective and evidence

Task: Choose one map and the report. For each, explain one kind of question the source helps answer and one kind it cannot answer well. Use a detail or stated source purpose to explain your choice.

Read the response: Map: helps locate/compare named streets/boundaries; weak for personal experiences/motives/precise construction chronology. Report: helps contractor/payment question; weak for all residents views/finished extent. Require detail/purpose link for each; do not infer author bias merely from category or claim all maps objective.

A voice still needed

Task: Choose a question about how Back Bay changes affected people. Name a group whose own account is absent from the supplied evidence, and a kind of source you would seek. Explain what that source might add without guessing what the people felt.

Read the response: Accept meaningful effects question (work, housing, access, displacement); group absent such as workers, women residents, Indigenous people or affected households; source like letter, diary, petition, payroll/tenancy record logically related. Explain possible evidence, no invented feeling or claim that one account represents everyone.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 7

Essex: earlier observation

Task: Describe a visible feature south of Essex Street and its relationship to the strip shown on this map. Use a printed label and a boundary or street detail.

Read the response: Orange Street along the narrow strip, Fortification across/near its lower end, Castle Street crossing, bounded narrow land strip. Require accurate label and relationship/boundary. No rename identity or cause.

Essex: later observation

Task: Describe two visible features south of Essex Street using their labels or drawn patterns. Keep the description about this map.

Read the response: Accept labeled streets such as Washington/Harrison/Albany, multiple street blocks, depots/rail lines, eastern shoreline/wharves shown. Two accurate located features; no unsupported Orange=Washington claim.

Essex: compare and qualify

Task: Use Essex Street and the location guide to compare the two details. Give an observation from each and an inference about the depicted pattern south of Essex. Add a limit involving coverage, location matching or scale.

Read the response: Earlier narrow bounded strip with Orange/Fortification versus later broad street/block/rail network south of Essex. Infer changed depicted land/street pattern, possible broader built area, with cautious location relation. Explicit differing coverage, scale or approximate anchor matching limit. No exact width ratio/acreage.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Response guidance 8

Essex: test the explanation

Task: A reader says, “Orange Street must be Washington Street, and the Back Bay report explains all the changes in this detail.” Explain why those two claims need more evidence.

Read the response: Neither map establishes street rename identity; need dated street-name record or reliable matching record. Back Bay report describes filling/payment in named Back Bay; cannot attribute all southern-detail changes to it. Need place-specific project/history evidence. Address both, without guessing rename history.

Replace the exhibit caption

Task: Write a caption of four to six sentences. Identify the two map titles or publication years; include one specific detail from each; explain what the report adds about Back Bay; and state a limit. Correct the draft’s claims about every pond, equally sized surveys and every resident.

Read the response: Caption identifies maps dates/titles, accurate paired Common/Back Bay vicinity details, report filling/payment in 1860 dated 1861. Limits every pond attribution, equal-scale survey assumption and universal benefit. Do not insist on same sentence order. A compact accurate caption may meet content criteria even if oral equivalent used. All three exaggerations corrected explicitly or replaced with clear bounded statements.

Plan one further source

Task: If the exhibit also wants to explain the effect on people, name one further source you would seek and one question you would ask of it.

Read the response: A person-centered source such as diary/letter/petition/tenancy or employment record plus related effects question. Source must plausibly address it; no fabricated quotation or presumed view. Accept multiple sources with a clear focused question.

Teacher Guide: Teach, Read the Response and Choose a Next Step

Optional routes to existing teaching tools

These existing tools can support a separate literacy or planning goal. The history inquiry remains complete without them. Use their methods with the supplied history evidence rather than copying their stories or treating two different maps as two accounts of one event.

- If students need the basic evidence-to-inference move, use Distinguish an Inference from a Guess: https://mentorteaching.com/resources/distinguish-an-inference-from-a-guess/
- If comparing source perspective is the goal, use the comparison organizer from Compare Two Accounts of the Same Event as a method bridge. Explain that these maps represent different dates: https://mentorteaching.com/resources/compare-two-accounts-of-the-same-event/
- If students have the history reasoning but need paragraph structure, use Write an Evidence-Based Paragraph: https://mentorteaching.com/resources/write-an-evidence-based-paragraph/
- For further-source searching, use Evaluate a Web Source’s Credibility to check author, repository, date and relevance. A dependable repository does not make every source claim complete: https://mentorteaching.com/resources/evaluate-a-web-source-s-credibility/
- For teacher planning, use Objective-to-Assessment Alignment Pack to align the source-reading goal with response components: https://mentorteaching.com/resources/objective-to-assessment-alignment-pack/
- Use Check for Understanding and Choose the Next Step to record a teaching move linked to the actual response: https://mentorteaching.com/resources/check-for-understanding-and-choose-the-next-step/
- Use Clear Directions and Language-Support Pack for clearer task wording, oral rehearsal or response stems while retaining the history reasoning: https://mentorteaching.com/resources/clear-directions-and-language-support-pack/

Fictional teaching response — sound for the named task

Named task: Independent check, Mill Pond, questions 3–4: compare a detail from each map, qualify the comparison, and decide whether the Back Bay report explains the Mill Pond change.

Fictional response — sound for the named task: “The 1775 map labels a bounded Mill Pond area. In the approximately matched northern area of the 1883 map I can identify Causeway Street and the Boston and Maine depot instead of that pond pattern. The maps support a change in the depicted area, but their different scale and coverage do not let me measure the exact amount filled or its completion date. The report is about Back Bay filling and payment for earlier work, not Mill Pond, so it does not establish the cause or date of this change.”

Visible evidence: Uses a detail from each map, draws a bounded inference, identifies a concrete comparison limit, and checks whether the report concerns the same place.

Not established: Does not establish the precise footprint, cause or date of filling, or transfer to unfamiliar maps. Accept other accurate labels and defensible limits.

Clarify: Ask the learner to point to both map details and explain how they matched the approximate area. Note any label-reading support.

Next teaching/evidence: Use the reserved South of Essex follow-up later, especially comparison question 3 and claim question 4. It changes the area and claims while reusing the original maps: describe it as a familiar-source follow-up, not a new-source or equivalent test.

This response is invented for teacher interpretation. Accept defensible alternatives. Record access, prior exposure and the actual response; do not assign an ability label or claim mastery from this example.

Later follow-up — familiar sources

Classroom copy · 2 November 2026

Fictional teaching response — partially developed

Named task: Independent check, Mill Pond, questions 3–4: compare a detail from each map, qualify the comparison, and decide whether the Back Bay report explains the Mill Pond change.

Fictional response — partially developed: “Mill Pond is on the earlier map, and Causeway Street is on the later one. The place changed. The maps do not tell us everything, so I would want another source.”

Visible evidence: Selects one potentially relevant label from each map and recognizes that the sources have limits.

Not established: Does not explain the depicted pattern change, give a specific comparison limitation, or decide whether the Back Bay report is relevant. A generic call for another source does not answer question 4.

Clarify: Ask what changed in the mapped pattern and what exact claim the maps cannot establish. Ask which place the report names before inferring confusion.

Next teaching/evidence: Use the supplied two-page Reteach task: describe a Common-map label and relationship, compare the later map using its anchors, then complete the observation, inference and “does not tell me” prompts. Model that a label is an observation while an explanation of change needs support. Return to Mill Pond questions 3–4 as familiar practice; reserve South of Essex for later familiar-source evidence.

This response is invented for teacher interpretation. Accept defensible alternatives. Record access, prior exposure and the actual response; do not assign an ability label or claim mastery from this example.

Reteach

Reserve: Later follow-up — familiar sources

Fictional teaching response — plausible error

Named task: Independent check, Mill Pond, questions 3–4: compare a detail from each map, qualify the comparison, and decide whether the Back Bay report explains the Mill Pond change.

Fictional response — plausible error: “Mill Pond is missing on the 1883 map, which proves it was all filled by 1861. The Back Bay report tells us why Mill Pond was filled, so it explains the whole change in Boston.”

Visible evidence: Notices a difference in map labels and attempts to connect a written source with the comparison.

Not established: Absence of a label does not prove an exact footprint or completion date. The report addresses another place, and its date does not make it an explanation for all mapped change.

Clarify: Ask where each place is named and which source actually states the proposed Mill Pond date. Check date reading and geographic matching before selecting further teaching.

Next teaching/evidence: Return to Model and guided practice pages 4–5. Point to Back Bay in the report; explain that its payment for earlier work concerns that location and does not date all Boston filling. Compare the supplied supported and overstrong claims. Have the learner replace the Mill Pond conclusion with one map observation, a limited inference and a specific unknown. Treat that return as practice; reserve the South of Essex follow-up for later, acknowledging its familiar maps.

This response is invented for teacher interpretation. Accept defensible alternatives. Record access, prior exposure and the actual response; do not assign an ability label or claim mastery from this example.

Model and guided practice

Reserve: Later follow-up — familiar sources